

present Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner. Entitled "The Nongovernmental Organization at Bay," this report describes the agonizing efforts of our nongovernmental organizations to raise sufficient funds with which to carry out their work, particularly at the international level. The report makes the point that increasingly the Federal Government is calling on these organizations to help carry out our farflung responsibilities. Yet the organizations are inadequately reimbursed by the Federal Government and inadequately supported by either the private foundations or private industry.

If this was a problem in 1966, when, according to the newspapers, many millions of dollars were being made available by the CIA to nongovernmental organizations for their international programs, how much greater will it be in the months and years ahead, now that these funds are apparently to be shut off? Even a cursory reading of the papers suggests the vacuum that will be created and the blow that will be dealt to international endeavors—whose value no one has questioned—being carried on in the interest of the United States by nongovernmental organizations such as the YWCA, the NEA, the Institute of Public Administration, the American Newspaper Guild, and the many others that have been mentioned.

In a masterpiece of prophesy, the Carnegie Corp. report in 1966 concluded with a paragraph on "the central issue," in which it asks some key questions:

The real issue is beginning to emerge clearly. Is the nongovernmental organization of the future to be simply an auxiliary to the state, a kind of willing but not very resourceful handmaiden? Or is it to be a strong, independent adjunct that provides government with a type of capability it cannot provide for itself?

If it is to be the latter, and for most Americans the question is one that is likely to admit of no other answer, then we must face up to the difficult problem of how we are to finance these organizations. More can be done on the private side, as private responsibility will—and should—continue. For example, there might perhaps be some advantages to be found in experimenting more widely with the notion of cooperative fund raising which has worked so well for some community chest organizations. But the question must also be raised as to whether responsibility for the general financial health of at least the most important of the nongovernmental organizations should not now be shared by the Federal Government. Certainly the time has come for a comprehensive and careful study of the problem from both the governmental and nongovernmental sides.

If such a study should confirm the findings suggested by informal evidence and indicate the need for a new approach by government, three problems will then have to be considered: the mechanism for distribution of general support, how much support can be given without compromising the independence of the organizations aided, and how quality can be maintained.

In the Carnegie report, Acting President Alan Pifer suggests that we consider something analogous to the National Science Foundation as a device for channeling general support grants to the nongovernmental organizations. Surely the time is now for us to put our

best talents to work to devise the best mechanism for such a purpose. For as the article concludes:

If we want to avoid an ever more extensive and powerful Federal Government, it would seem that we must now, paradoxically, use federal money to ensure that we have a viable alternative—a network of vigorous, well-financed nongovernmental organizations ready to serve government but able, in the public interest, to maintain their independence of it. This further financial burden on government may be unpalatable to many. But the logic of it is hard to escape.

Because it expresses so well this general point of view, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the Detroit News editorial of February 19, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Detroit News, Feb. 19, 1967]
CIA NOT PLAYING CRICKET—COLD WAR NO GAME

The first factor to take into account in the furor over CIA secret funds for university students is that major powers—and they are not all Communist—have for years been trying to influence students and other opinion-forming groups of the coming generation in every land.

It is a subtle, behind-the-scenes game, as most Cold War activities are. By the very nature of the game, any acknowledgement that any nation participates or has participated in it clandestinely is a rarity. Forget the cliché about playing the game. The hard fact is that not to participate is to leave the field of potential proselytes wide open to the opposition.

With foundations acting as go-betweens—as a cover for the source—CIA funds since the early 1950s have gone to the National Student Association to help finance representatives to student congresses abroad, to fund student exchange programs and to provide technical aid and counseling in seminars abroad on higher education and student leadership.

The project began when student groups in this country were unable to get funds from private groups or foundations here for work abroad. Those American students studying overseas at that time or those attending Congresses abroad were only too well and painfully aware that Soviet front organizations with whom, in a sense, they were competing in influencing the third world, were heavily financed and totally controlled by Moscow.

That being the situation, was this nation—powerful, with the means, and thrust into the role of western leadership—to sit on its hands and watch the other side win the Battle for the Minds of the Next Generation? NSA decided to accept CIA money to join battle and continued to do so until two years ago when NSA ended the relationship.

NSA itself says it was never a tool of the CIA. It served no intelligence function. No young American minds were being corrupted. NSA provided no sensitive information to any U.S. agency. It didn't even support all facets of U.S. foreign policy.

No American will contend we should have lost by default this struggle forced upon us when the Cold War was beginning. The ferment is over whether the CIA should have been the agency involved. In some Americans' book, the CIA is as much of a menace as communism; they fool themselves that the Cold War is a game of cricket. The CIA was not established as an organization to observe gentlemanly rules and never play dirty. It must meet the foe on a wide open battleground on his terms.

Its alleged failures we hear about soon

enough. Its involvement in the Bay of Pigs will provide ammunition to its detractors for years. Its successes—again, by the very nature of the game—go unheralded. One such success must be its help to students for a decade. Without that aid, those students would have been chairborne in this country instead of countering falsehood and pleading democracy's cause overseas.

The CIA did not ask for the job. Yet those now bewailing CIA involvement, including some former students who took CIA cash, plead why not let the State Department do the job, or the USIA, or someone else, like Dick or Tom or Harry? The short answer is that congressmen in charge of State Department appropriations don't realize the sort of competition for young minds we are involved in and won't foot the bill. The CIA had the funds at the time and it stepped into the vacuum.

A good case can be made out to let some other George, not the CIA, do it. The CIA would probably be delighted if that happened. If today there are funds from private foundations to do the work, fine. If a privately administered and government-supported organization will do the job, splendid. Let's establish one.

The fault in this furor lies within ourselves for not recognizing the intellectual world outside these shores is a legitimate prize in the Cold War. Another fault, when the realization is forced on us, is screaming because some private Mr. Clean didn't pick up the gauntlet in the 1950s. The George who did it may not be St. George, but he helped do the job.

UNSUNG HEROES

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, with the major emphasis centered on our military effort in Vietnam, we tend to give less attention to the other war being fought in that country—the shirtsleeves war against hunger, poverty, and disease.

The Agency for International Development has many capable men dedicated to helping the Vietnamese people solve their problems. They are hard at work in the provinces of Vietnam teaching the Vietnamese to help themselves. Their work is done quietly. News of the small battles won daily seldom reach our newspapers, nor do the heroes of this other war receive medals for their acts of bravery and sacrifice.

Mr. Richard Ehrlich of New Haven, Conn., is serving with AID as a provincial representative outside Saigon. Recently the Agency's weekly newspaper, Front Lines, published a feature article describing the splendid work Mr. Ehrlich is doing. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Front Lines, Feb. 15, 1967]

"RIVER RAT" HELPS "28 YELLOW ORCHID" SURVIVE IN WAR

"Blue Moon, Blue Moon, this is River Rat."
"River Rat, this is Blue Moon, go ahead."
"River Rat departing home station for 28 Yellow Orchid will arrive 0720."
"Roger, River Rat. Please check in on arrival. Blue Moon out."

EARLY LAUNCHING

It was 7 a.m. as "River Rat," who is really Dick Ehrlich, AID's "Prov Rep" in Gia Dinh Province near Saigon, switched off his radio transmitter and pulled away from "Blue Moon," the U.S. Navy base at Na Be, Vietnam. He maneuvered his outboard-powered, plastic assault boat through the junks, sam-